



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/921,423	08/02/2001	Randhir P.S. Thakur	3978.1US (95-0064.1)	8029

24247 7590 02/14/2002

TRASK BRITT  
P.O. BOX 2550  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84110

EXAMINER

MONDT, JOHANNES P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2826

DATE MAILED: 02/14/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/921,423

Applicant(s)

THAKUR ET AL.

Examiner

Johannes P Mondt

Art Unit

2826

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 August 2001 and 31 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

The examiner has received the Preliminary Amendment A filed 01/31/02 which has been entered as Paper No. 3

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The examiner has considered the items listed in the Information Disclosure Statement of 08/02/01.

### ***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the a plurality of layers of boro-phospho silicate glass and a plurality of layers of germanium boro-phospho silicate glass, at least a portion of at least one layer of said plurality of layers of germanium boro-phospho silicate glass contacting at least a portion of at least one of said plurality of layers of boro-phospho silicate glass" (claim 2) must be shown or the feature canceled from the claim. A fortiori, the simpler feature analogous to the aforementioned feature in claim 1 must be shown or the feature canceled from the claim. *The fault is with the drawings:* "alternating layers" are indicated with numerals 110 and 120, which numerals point to layers on different sides, hence not contacting

Art Unit: 2826

each other. Instead, the alternating layers are to be found on each separate stack. No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. ***Claim 1*** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsia et al (5,827,783) in view of Wolf et al (ISBN 0-9616721-6-1) and Haller et al (5,804,506).

With reference to Figs. 6-8: Hsia et al teach a semiconductor memory device (cf. column 1, line 6 and column 4, lines 12-13) comprising:

at least one layer of a nonconductive oxide with a first etch rate 62 (cf. column 5, lines 33-35);

at least one layer of a nonconductive oxide with a second etch rate 64 (cf. column 4, line 66 – column 5, line 1);

said nonconductive oxide layer with second etching rate having a portion contacting at least a portion of said at least one layer of nonconductive oxide with first etching rate.

Hsia et al do not necessarily teach the nonconductive oxide with first etch rate to be boro-phospho silicate glass and the nonconductive oxide with second etch rate to be germanium boro-phospho silicate glass. However, the use of boro-phospho silicate glass (BPSG) is a standard choice for the dielectric in capacitors in the semiconductor device art as evidenced by Wolf et al because of ease of deposition at relatively low temperature, reduced stress, and relatively low glass flow temperatures (pages 198-201), while it has been known for years that germanium doping of boro-phospho silicate glass markedly increases the etch rate (both wet and dry) of boro-phospho silicate glass, as witnessed by Haller (Abstract, fifth and sixth sentence; column 2, lines 65-67, and column 3, lines 17-24; cf. also Figs. 2 and 3).

*Therefore, it would have been obvious* to one of ordinary skills in the art to modify the invention by Hsia et al at the time it was made so as to select boro-phospho silicate glass ( $B_2O_3 - P_2O_5 - SiO_2$ , hence a nonconductive oxide) for the aforementioned at least one layer 62, and to select germanium boro-phospho silicate glass (also a nonconductive oxide) for the aforementioned at least one layer 64.

4. **Claim 2** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsia et al (5,827,783) in view of Wolf et al (ISBN 0-9616721-6-1) and Haller et al (5,804,506). With reference to Figs. 6-8: Hsia et al teach a semiconductor memory device (cf. column 1, line 6 and column 4, lines 12-13) comprising:

a plurality of layers of a nonconductive oxide with a first etch rate 62 (cf. column 5, lines 33-35);

a plurality of layers of a nonconductive oxide with a second etch rate 64 (cf. column 4, line 66 – column 5, line 1);

at least a portion of at least one layer of said plurality of nonconductive oxide layers with second etching rate contacting at least a portion of at least one layer of said plurality of nonconductive oxide with first etching rate (cf. Figs. 6-8).

Hsia et al do not necessarily teach the nonconductive oxide with first etch rate to be boro-phospho silicate glass and the nonconductive oxide with second etch rate to be germanium boro-phospho silicate glass. However, the use of boro-phospho silicate glass (BPSG) is a standard choice for the dielectric in capacitors in the semiconductor device art as evidenced by Wolf et al because of ease of deposition at relatively low temperature, reduced stress, and relatively low glass flow temperatures (pages 198-201), while it has been known for years that germanium doping of boro-phospho silicate glass markedly increases the etch rate (both wet and dry) of boro-phospho silicate glass, as witnessed by Haller (Abstract, fifth and sixth sentence; column 2, lines 65-67, and column 3, lines 17-24; cf. also Figs. 2 and 3).

*Therefore, it would have been obvious* to one of ordinary skills in the art to modify the invention by Hsia et al at the time it was made so as to select boro-phospho silicate glass ( $B_2O_3 - P_2O_5 - SiO_2$ , hence a nonconductive oxide) for the aforementioned at nonconductive oxide 62, and to select germanium boro-phospho silicate glass (also a nonconductive oxide) for the aforementioned nonconductive 64.

5. **Claim 3** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsia et al (5,827,783) in view of Wolf et al (ISBN 0-9616721-6-1) and Haller et al (5,804,506).

Art Unit: 2826

With reference to Figs. 6-8: Hsia et al teach a semiconductor memory device (cf.

column 1, line 6 and column 4, lines 12-13) comprising:

a plurality of layers of a nonconductive oxide (with a first etch rate) 62 (cf. column 5, lines 33-35);

a plurality of layers of a nonconductive oxide (with a second etch rate) 64 (cf. column 4, line 66 – column 5, line 1);

each layer of said plurality of layers 64 having at least a portion thereof contacting at least a portion of at least one layer of said plurality of layers 62 (cf. Figs. 6-8).

Hsia et al do not necessarily teach the nonconductive oxide layers 62 to be borophospho silicate glass and the nonconductive oxide layers 64 to be germanium borophospho silicate glass. However, the use of borophospho silicate glass (BPSG) is a standard choice for the dielectric in capacitors in the semiconductor device art as evidenced by Wolf et al because of ease of deposition at relatively low temperature, reduced stress, and relatively low glass flow temperatures (pages 198-201), while it has been known for years that germanium doping of borophospho silicate glass markedly increases the etch rate (both wet and dry) of borophospho silicate glass, as witnessed by Haller (Abstract, fifth and sixth sentence; column 2, lines 65-67, and column 3, lines 17-24; cf. also Figs. 2 and 3).

*Therefore, it would have been obvious* to one of ordinary skills in the art to modify the invention by Hsia et al at the time it was made so as to select borophospho silicate glass ( $B_2O_3 - P_2O_5 - SiO_2$ , hence a nonconductive oxide) for the aforementioned at

Art Unit: 2826

nonconductive oxide layers 62, and to select germanium boro-phospho silicate glass (also a nonconductive oxide) for the aforementioned nonconductive layers 64.

6. **Claim 4** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsia et al (5,827,783) in view of Wolf et al (ISBN 0-9616721-6-1) and Haller et al (5,804,506).

With reference to Figs. 6-8: Hsia et al teach a semiconductor memory device (cf. column 1, line 6 and column 4, lines 12-13) comprising:

at least one layer of a nonconductive oxide (with a first etch rate) 62 (cf. column 5, lines 33-35);

at least one layer of a nonconductive oxide (with a second etch rate) 64 (cf. column 4, line 66 – column 5, line 1) having at least a portion thereof contacting at least a portion of said at least one layer 62 (cf. Figs. 6-8).

*Hsia et al do not necessarily teach* the nonconductive oxide layers 62 to be boro-phospho silicate glass and the nonconductive oxide layers 64 to be germanium boro-phospho silicate glass. However, the use of boro-phospho silicate glass (BPSG) is a standard choice for the dielectric in capacitors in the semiconductor device art as evidenced by Wolf et al because of ease of deposition at relatively low temperature, reduced stress, and relatively low glass flow temperatures (pages 198-201), while it has been known for years that germanium doping of boro-phospho silicate glass markedly increases the etch rate (both wet and dry) of boro-phospho silicate glass, as witnessed by Haller (Abstract, fifth and sixth sentence; column 2, lines 65-67, and column 3, lines 17-24; cf. also Figs. 2 and 3).



*Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to modify the invention by Hsia et al at the time it was made so as to select boro-phospho silicate glass ( $B_2O_3 - P_2O_5 - SiO_2$ , hence a nonconductive oxide) for the aforementioned at nonconductive oxide layers 62, and to select germanium boro-phospho silicate glass (also a nonconductive oxide) for the aforementioned nonconductive layers 64.*

7. **Claim 5** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsia et al (5,827,783) in view of Wolf et al (ISBN 0-9616721-6-1) and Haller et al (5,804,506). With reference to Figs. 6-8: Hsia et al teach a semiconductor memory device (cf. column 1, line 6 and column 4, lines 12-13) comprising:

a plurality of layers of a nonconductive oxide (with a first etch rate) 62 (cf. column 5, lines 33-35);

a plurality of layers of a nonconductive oxide (with a second etch rate) 64 (cf. column 4, line 66 – column 5, line 1) at least a portion of at least one layer of said plurality of layers 64 contacting at least a portion of at least one layer of said plurality of layers 62 (cf. Figs. 6-8).

*Hsia et al do not necessarily teach the nonconductive oxide layers 62 to be boro-phospho silicate glass and the nonconductive oxide layers 64 to be germanium boro-phospho silicate glass. However, the use of boro-phospho silicate glass (BPSG) is a standard choice for the dielectric in capacitors in the semiconductor device art as evidenced by Wolf et al because of ease of deposition at relatively low temperature, reduced stress, and relatively low glass flow temperatures (pages 198-201), while it has*

Art Unit: 2826

been known for years that germanium doping of boro-phospho silicate glass markedly increases the etch rate (both wet and dry) of boro-phospho silicate glass, as witnessed by Haller (Abstract, fifth and sixth sentence; column 2, lines 65-67, and column 3, lines 17-24; cf. also Figs. 2 and 3).

*Therefore, it would have been obvious* to one of ordinary skills in the art to modify the invention by Hsia et al at the time it was made so as to select boro-phospho silicate glass ( $B_2O_3 - P_2O_5 - SiO_2$ , hence a nonconductive oxide) for the aforementioned at nonconductive oxide layers 62, and to select germanium boro-phospho silicate glass (also a nonconductive oxide) for the aforementioned nonconductive layers 64.

8. **Claim 6** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsia et al (5,827,783) in view of Wolf et al (ISBN 0-9616721-6-1) and Haller et al (5,804,506).

With reference to Figs. 6-8: Hsia et al teach a semiconductor memory device (cf. column 1, line 6 and column 4, lines 12-13) comprising:

a plurality of layers of a nonconductive oxide (with a first etch rate) 62 (cf. column 5, lines 33-35);

a plurality of layers of a nonconductive oxide (with a second etch rate) 64 (cf. column 4, line 66 – column 5, line 1), each layer of said plurality of layers 64 having at least a portion thereof contacting at least a portion of at least one layer of said plurality of layers 62 (cf. Figs. 6-8).

*Hsia et al do not necessarily teach* the nonconductive oxide layers 62 to be boro-phospho silicate glass and the nonconductive oxide layers 64 to be germanium boro-

Art Unit: 2826

phospho silicate glass. However, the use of boro-phospho silicate glass (BPSG) is a standard choice for the dielectric in capacitors in the semiconductor device art as evidenced by Wolf et al because of ease of deposition at relatively low temperature, reduced stress, and relatively low glass flow temperatures (pages 198-201), while it has been known for years that germanium doping of boro-phospho silicate glass markedly increases the etch rate (both wet and dry) of boro-phospho silicate glass, as witnessed by Haller (Abstract, fifth and sixth sentence; column 2, lines 65-67, and column 3, lines 17-24; cf. also Figs. 2 and 3).

*Therefore, it would have been obvious* to one of ordinary skills in the art to modify the invention by Hsia et al at the time it was made so as to select boro-phospho silicate glass ( $B_2O_3 - P_2O_5 - SiO_2$ , hence a nonconductive oxide) for the aforementioned at nonconductive oxide layers 62, and to select germanium boro-phospho silicate glass (also a nonconductive oxide) for the aforementioned nonconductive layers 64.

9. **Claim 7** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsia et al (5,827,783) in view of Wolf et al (ISBN 0-9616721-6-1) and Haller et al (5,804,506).

With reference to Figs. 7 and 8: Hsia et al teach a semiconductor memory device (cf. column 1, line 6 and column 4, lines 12-13) comprising: at least one capacitor cell 78 (cf. column 6, line 47) having a portion thereof formed by at least one layer of nonconductive oxide 62 (cf. column 5, lines 33-35) and at least one layer of nonconductive oxide 64 (cf. column 4, line 66 – column 5, line 1) having at least a portion thereof contacting at least a portion of said at least one layer of nonconductive oxide 62.

*Hsia et al do not necessarily teach* the nonconductive oxide layers 62 to be boro-phospho silicate glass and the nonconductive oxide layers 64 to be germanium boro-phospho silicate glass. However, the use of boro-phospho silicate glass (BPSG) is a standard choice for the dielectric in capacitors in the semiconductor device art as evidenced by Wolf et al because of ease of deposition at relatively low temperature, reduced stress, and relatively low glass flow temperatures (pages 198-201), while it has been known for years that germanium doping of boro-phospho silicate glass markedly increases the etch rate (both wet and dry) of boro-phospho silicate glass, as witnessed by Haller (Abstract, fifth and sixth sentence; column 2, lines 65-67, and column 3, lines 17-24; cf. also Figs. 2 and 3).

*Therefore, it would have been obvious* to one of ordinary skills in the art to modify the invention by Hsia et al at the time it was made so as to select boro-phospho silicate glass ( $B_2O_3 - P_2O_5 - SiO_2$ , hence a nonconductive oxide) for the aforementioned at nonconductive oxide layers 62, and to select germanium boro-phospho silicate glass (also a nonconductive oxide) for the aforementioned nonconductive layers 64.

10. **Claim 8** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsia et al (5,827,783) in view of Wolf et al (ISBN 0-9616721-6-1) and Haller et al (5,804,506). With reference to Figs. 7 and 8: Hsia et al teach a semiconductor memory device (cf. column 1, line 6 and column 4, lines 12-13) comprising: at least one capacitor cell 78 (cf. column 6, line 47) having a portion thereof formed by a plurality of layers of nonconductive oxide 62 (cf. column 5, lines 33-35) and a plurality of layers of non-

2826

ive oxide 64 (cf. column 4, line 66 – column 5, line 1), at least a portion of at  
e layer of said plurality of layers 64 contacting at least a portion of at least one  
said plurality of layers of nonconductive oxide 62.

*Hsia et al do not necessarily teach* the nonconductive oxide layers 62 to be boro-  
o silicate glass and the nonconductive oxide layers 64 to be germanium boro-  
o silicate glass. However, the use of boro-phospho silicate glass (BPSG) is a  
d choice for the dielectric in capacitors in the semiconductor device art as  
ed by Wolf et al because of ease of deposition at relatively low temperature,  
l stress, and relatively low glass flow temperatures (pages 198-201), while it has  
own for years that germanium doping of boro-phospho silicate glass markedly  
es the etch rate (both wet and dry) of boro-phospho silicate glass, as witnessed  
r (Abstract, fifth and sixth sentence; column 2, lines 65-67, and column 3, lines  
f. also Figs. 2 and 3).

*Therefore, it would have been obvious* to one of ordinary skills in the art to modify  
ntion by Hsia et al at the time it was made so as to select boro-phospho silicate  
 $\text{SiO}_2 - \text{P}_2\text{O}_5 - \text{SiO}_2$ , hence a nonconductive oxide) for the aforementioned at  
ductive oxide layers 62, and to select germanium boro-phospho silicate glass  
onconductive oxide) for the aforementioned nonconductive layers 64.

**Claims 9, 10 and 13 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable  
a et al (5,827,783) in view of Wolf et al (ISBN 0-9616721-6-1) and Haller et al  
06). With reference to Figs. 7 and 8: Hsia et al teach a semiconductor memory

device (cf. column 1, line 6 and column 4, lines 12-13) comprising: at least one capacitor cell 78 (cf. column 6, line 47) having a portion thereof formed by a plurality of layers of nonconductive oxide 62 (cf. column 5, lines 33-35) and a plurality of layers of non-conductive oxide 64 (cf. column 4, line 66 – column 5, line 1), each layer of 64 having at least a portion thereof contacting at least a portion thereof contacting of at least one layer of said plurality of layers 64 contacting at least a portion of at least one layer of said plurality of layers 62.

*Hsia et al do not necessarily teach* the nonconductive oxide layers 62 to be boro-phospho silicate glass and the nonconductive oxide layers 64 to be germanium boro-phospho silicate glass. However, the use of boro-phospho silicate glass (BPSG) is a standard choice for the dielectric in capacitors in the semiconductor device art as evidenced by Wolf et al because of ease of deposition at relatively low temperature, reduced stress, and relatively low glass flow temperatures (pages 198-201), while it has been known for years that germanium doping of boro-phospho silicate glass markedly increases the etch rate (both wet and dry) of boro-phospho silicate glass, as witnessed by Haller (Abstract, fifth and sixth sentence; column 2, lines 65-67, and column 3, lines 17-24; cf. also Figs. 2 and 3).

*Therefore, it would have been obvious* to one of ordinary skills in the art to modify the invention by Hsia et al at the time it was made so as to select boro-phospho silicate glass ( $B_2O_3 - P_2O_5 - SiO_2$ , hence a nonconductive oxide) for the aforementioned at nonconductive oxide layers 62, and to select germanium boro-phospho silicate glass (also a nonconductive oxide) for the aforementioned nonconductive layers 64.

*With regard to claim 10:* the semiconductor memory device taught by Hsia et al further comprises at least one dielectric layer (cf. column 7, line 5) and a conductive layer (cf. column 7, line 4) over said at least one dielectric layer ("over said" is not taught verbatim but examiner takes official notice that this is obvious in the art of capacitors generally and in the art of semiconductor memory device capacitors in particular, in the sense that otherwise one would not have a capacitor).

*With regard to claim 13:* the semiconductor memory device of Hsia et al further comprises at least one dielectric layer covering at least portions of said plurality of layers 62 and 64; and a conductive layer covering at least a portion of said dielectric layer (cf. column 7, lines 4-6).

12. **Claim 11** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsia et al, Wolf et al, and Haller et al as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Kawakubo (5,889,696). As detailed above, claim 10 (on which claim 11 depends) is unpatentable over Hsia et al in view of Wolf et al and Haller et al, neither of whom, however, specifically teach the semiconductor memory device of claim 10 with the further limitation as defined by claim 11.

*However, particularly the use of BST as a high dielectric in capacitors in semiconductor memory devices has long been taught as a means to increase the charge storage capacity of capacitors, as witnessed, for example, by Kawakubo et al, who teach a semiconductor memory device (cf. Abstract, first sentence) with capacitor (cf. Abstract, first sentence) for the very purpose of achieving very high charge storage*

Art Unit: 2826

ability through the very high dielectric constant of BST (cf. column 9, lines 58-63).

*Therefore, it would have been obvious* to one of ordinary skills in the art to modify the invention by Hsia et al at the time it was made so as to include the further limitation of claim 11.

13. **Claim 12** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsia et al, Wolf et al, and Haller et al as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of De Boer et al (5,930,106 and DERWENT copy, under "Novelty"). As detailed above, claim 10 (on which claim 12 depends) is unpatentable over Hsia et al in view of Wolf et al and Haller et al, who, however, do not specifically teach the conductive layer to comprise Si-Ge.

*However, Si-Ge has long been taught as semiconductor memory device capacitor electrode material for the purpose of high reliability*, as evidenced by De Boer et al, who teach a Si-Ge capacitor plate for the purpose of achieving high reliability (cf. particularly the DERWENT SUMMARY of De Boer et al) in a semiconductor memory device capacitor (cf. Abstract, final sentence; column 2, lines 24-28). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to modify the invention of Hsia et al at the time it was made so as to include the further limitation of claim 12.



Art Unit: 2826

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Johannes P Mondt whose telephone number is 703-306-0531. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 18:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J Flynn can be reached on 703-308-6601. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

JPM  
February 9, 2002

